DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 574 PS 012 162

AUTHOR Carter, Herman
TITLE Evaluation of the Follow Through Title I Expansion Program.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO 8143
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Classroom Environment; *Parent Participation; Primary Education; Program Evaluation; School Health Services; *Staff Development; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS California Achievement Tests; Philadelphia School District PA; *Project Follow Through Expansion Program

ABSTRACT

The Follow Through Title I Expansion Program involving kindergarten through third-grade classes in 28 schools in Philadelphia District 1-7 was evaluated in 1979-1980 in the areas of classroom process/implementation, achievement, parent involvement, staff development and supportive services. The evaluation report consists of 22 tables of data with accompanying summary statements. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202574

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF THE

FOLLOW THROUGH TITLE I EXPANSION PROGRAM

Prepared By:

Herman Carter

of the

Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report #8143

March, 1981

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Thomas McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

Bernard Solomon
Eexecutive Director

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

PS012162

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
School District of Philadelphia
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Mr. Samuel H. Rubin

Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

Dr. Nicholas Trolio

* * * * * * * * * * *

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Mr. Charles A. Highsmith, Deputy Superintendent

Mrs. Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Programs

Dr. Constance E. Clayton
Associate Superintendent
Early Childhood Education

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

ABSTRACT

The Follow Through Title I Expansion Program located in 28 schools was evaluated in 1979-1980 in the areas of classroom process/implementation, achievement, parent involvement, staff development and supportive services.

Small group instruction was predominant grouping pattern for instructional purposes. Across all options, aides and parent scholars provided instructional support to groups consisting of 2 to 10 children. In general each option appeared to exhibit expected characteristics.

Achievement data from citywide tests in 1980 showed that the Total Follow Through Expansion Program (TEXP) significantly outperformed the Total Non-Follow Through (NFT) Title I eligible comparison group in Reading in grades two and three and Math in grades one and two. Higher performance was consistently associated with Option 4 in relation to the NFT group.

Parent involvement data indicated that Follow Through Expansion parents contributed a total of 21,789 hours in school related and workshop activity. Parents who volunteered for school activities spent the majority of their time assisting in program classrooms.

An analysis of responses from a staff development questionnaire showed that the majority of teachers and aides had experience in early childhood as well as program experience. The majority of teachers and aides indicated that they were satisfied with the services they received from supervisory and support personnel. Teachers felt that staff development activities related to improving basic skills instruction and parent involvement resulted in greater classroom effectiveness.

Data from the school district health division indicated that 86% of program children in grade one, the grade for which physical examinations were mandated, received physical examinations. In addition, the majority of children in grades 1, 2, and 3 received medical/dental screenings. A total of 3,536 medical problems were identified and all were referred for treatment. Forty percent of the problems were either treated or still under care at the end of the year.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY:

EVALUATION OF THE FOLLOW THROUGH
TITLE I EXPANSION PROGRAM, 1979-1980

Program Description

The Follow Through Title I Expansion Program involves 28 schools in District 1-7, and ranges from Kindergarten through Third Grade. The program, introduced in late Spring 1974-1975, is a direct spin-off from the original, national, Follow Through Program. The two most successful models from the parent program, Behavior Analysis and Bank Street, provide the basic direction for the instructional component. Four model options provide the instructional approach for the program: Option 1, a local adaptation of the Behavior Analysis Model, Option 2, a Behavior Analysis/Bank Street combination, Option 4, a local adaptation of the Bank Street Model and Option 5, a Bank Street/Bilingual combination. A parent scholarship program is an integral part of the program, where parents receive a training stipend for classroom participation.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY:

EVALUATION OF THE FOLLOW THROUGH
TITLE I EXPANSION PROGRAM, 1979-1980

I. OBSERVED ACTIVITIES

A. Proportion of Staff Time Devoted to Instruction

Table 1

Staffing and Instructional Support
Patterns Across All Options

VARIABLE	OPTION 1		OPTION 2		OPTION 4		OPTION 5	
STAFF - % of time present								
Teacher	100		100		100		100	
Aide	86		75		44		61	
Parent Scholar	63		78		47		22	
INSTRUCTIONAL SUP.	Aide	PS	Aide	PS	Aide	PS	Aide	PS
% of class assisted when present	23	17	28	24	24	21	14	3
Average # pupils assisted when present	4	3	6	5	6	5	3	1
% of time spent assisting when present	79	57	95	86	100	93	45	25
SUBJECT MATTER (predominant)	Language Arts Arithmetic Reading		Arithmetic Reading Language Arts		Reading Arithmetic Language Arts		Arithmetic Language Arts	

Summary Statement: These data were obtained from classroom observations in a 25% sample of program classrooms utilizing the Classroom Observation Routine (COR). The COR was developed by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit (ECEU) in the mid 1970's and has been used every year since then.

Teachers were observed present at all times in all options. Aides were present to a higher degree in Option 1. Parent scholars were more visible in Option 2. In each option, there were aides and parent scholars devoting time to instructional support with small groups of students. Options 4 and 2 respectively showed the highest amount of time given to this support.

B. Percentage of Instructional Time Devoted to Small Group Instruction

Table 2

Grouping Patterns* for Instructional Purposes Across All Options

VARIABLE	OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 4	OPTION 5
LOCATION (group type)	N = 22	N = 28	N = 58	N = 18
Teacher	Whole 36% Small 55% Large 9%	Small 50% Large 29% Whole 21%	Whole 52% Large 24% Small 19% Individual 5%	Whole 56% Small 11% Large 33%
Aide	N = 19 Small 74% Large 11% Whole 5% Other 11%	N = 21 Small 76% Large 10% Whole 10% Individual 5%	N = 25 Small 72% Individual 8% Large 16% Other 4%	N = 11 Whole 64% Small 27% Large 9%
Parent Scholar	N = 14 Small 71% Whole 14% Other 14%	N = 22 Small 82% Large 5% Whole 9% Individual 5%	N = 27 Small 14% Large 4% Ind. 15% Whole 7%	N = 4 Small 25% Whole 75%

* Whole group = 76% or more of the class; Large group = over 10 children; Small group = 2 to 10 children; Individual = 1 child.

Summary Statement: Teachers in Options 1 and 2 gave approximately 50% of their time to small group instruction. Teachers in those options also utilized the parent scholars in a similar manner, i. e., much more for small group instruction. With the exception of Option 5, program aides spent more than 70% of their time providing small group instruction.

C. Specific Option Elements Observed During Classroom Observations

Table 3

Percentage of Observations Where Presence of Specific Materials Were Noted

VARIABLE	OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 4	OPTION 5
MATERIALS		PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS		
Library center	14	18	7	44
2+ Activity centers	91	68	93	94
Child-made charts, graphs	9	18	34	6
SAPA Kits	0	0	0	0
Attendance board	0	32	32	0
Choice board	9	0	12	11
Job chart	14	54	27	0
Token menu/contract	45	36	0	0
Programmed workbooks	82	7	34	56
Ethnic materials	32	25	36	67
Environmental projects	18	11	27	6
Diaries	0	4	27	0

Summary Statement: Attendance boards appeared exclusively in Options 2 and 4. Child made charts and graphs were most evident in those options also. Activity centers were common to all options. Environmental projects and diaries were most often associated with Option 4. Token menus and contracts were found in 45% and 36% of the observed classroom in Options 1 and 2. Programmed workbooks appeared most often in Options 1 and 5. Overall, the options appeared to be associated with expected usage of materials/procedures.

D. Teacher and Student Interaction

Table 4

Teacher and Student Interaction in Program Classrooms*

VARIABLE	OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 4	OPTION 5
TEACHER		AVERAGE FREQUENCY PER OBSERVATION		
Read	0.5	0.3	8	2
Organized	31	33	39	45
Questioned	29	37	14	37
Gave information	12	7	2	8
Approved	9	9	3	4
Praised (specific)	3	1	3	0.5
Rewarded	9	5	0	0
Commented on behavior	0.2	0.3	2	0.3
CHILDREN				
Responded to teacher questions	32	46	26	41
		PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS		
Wrote an original piece	0	0	3	0
Read silently or aloud	9	14	14	11
Measured or compared	5	0	3	0
Observed events or objects	5	0	0	0
Classified	0	4	2	0
Applied numbers	5	18	22	0
Add, subtract, multiply divide	9	11	8	6
Responded to IF, HOW, WHY, or CONDITIONAL questions	45	71	14	78
Talked to other children (approved)	5	0	15	22

* For the Teacher categories and "children responding to teacher questions" category. This table indicates the average number which occurred during a ten minute recording period. All other items relating to the children were noted as present or absent during the observation and the entries represent the percentage of observations where the item was observed.

Summary Statement: Across all options, teachers devoted about equal time to organizing the children for instructional purposes. Questioning children to elicit the required response was used with about equal frequency. Also, in 26% to 46% of the observed classrooms, children responded to teacher questions related to reading and math. The use of rewards occurred in Options 1 and 2 only, as expected. Other reinforcement techniques such as specific praise and approval appeared in all options, and only "approval" appeared to be more frequent in Options 1 and 2.

Table 5

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of Follow Through Title I Expansion (FTX) Students and the Non-Follow Through (NFT)* Title I Comparison Group in Grade One For Total Reading on the California Achievement Test, (CAT), February, 1980

FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Difference	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Significance Level
Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
TO 4	386	272.01	33.89	NFT	924	265.84	35.22	6.17	1308	2.92	.05
D1/04	70	282.73	34.67	D1	261	261.96	36.27	20.77	329	4.28	.05
D2/02	89	288.66	34.23	D2	162	266.82	33.89	21.84	255	4.87	.05
D5/04	82	286.98	31.87	D5	88	255.73	33.25	31.25	168	6.21	.05

Summary Statement: In Grade 1 Reading, Total Option 4 had a significantly higher mean score than the NFT comparison group. Within districts, this option's districts 1 and District 5 groups also exceeded their NFT district counterparts. The only other district grouping with significantly higher performance was Option 2 in District 2.

*The NFT group is made up of Title I eligible students not in the Follow Through Program.

TO4 = Total Option 4
D1/04 = District 1 - Option 4
D2/02 = District 2 - Option 2
D5/04 = District 5 - Option 4

NFT = Non-Follow Through
D1 = District 1
D2 = District 2
D5 = District 5

Table 6

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of FTX Students and the NFT Title I Comparison Group in Grade Two for Total Reading on the California Achievement Test, (CAT), February, 1980.

Follow Through Expansion				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Difference	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Significance Level
Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
TFX	1475	304.68	40.37	NFT	935	301.75	35.38	2.93	2408	1.82	.05
TO4	450	308.25	43.34	NFT	935	301.75	35.38	6.50	1383	2.97	.05
D5/04	56	318.11	40.23	D5	115	295.41	33.09	22.70	169	3.90	.05
D6/04	246	313.92	40.62	D6	80	298.88	31.20	15.04	324	3.02	.05
D5/01	90	327.43	42.30	D5	115	295.41	33.09	32.02	203	4.05	.05
D2/02	80	309.40	49.77	D2	146	297.81	29.96	11.59	224	3.46	.05

TFX = Total Follow Through Expansion
TO4 = Total Option 4
D5/04 District 5 - Option 4
D6/04 District 6 - Option 4
D5/01 District 5 - Option 1
D2/02 District 2 - Option 2
NFT = Non-Follow Through
D5 = District 5
D6 = District 6
D2 = District 2

Summary Statement: The Total FTX group was significantly higher than Total NFT in Grade 2 Reading. Total Option 4 was also higher. FTX district groupings outperforming their respective NFT district groups were: Option 4 in Districts 5 and 6, Option 1 in District 5, and Option 2 in District 2.

Table 7

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of FTX Students and the NFT Title I Comparison Group in Grade Three for Total Reading on the California Achievement Test, (CAT), February, 1980.

Follow Through Expansion				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Difference	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Significance Level
Group *	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
TFX	633	327.60	48.23	TNFT	1106	321.63	42.42	5.97	1737	2.06	.05
TO4	341	329.23	54.98	TNFT	1106	321.63	42.42	7.60	1445	2.68	.05
D1/04	95	338.97	71.79	D1	343	320.92	41.28	18.05	436	3.14	.05
D2/04	58	342.27	54.51	D2	150	311.65	37.00	30.62	256	4.62	.05
D1/01	87	340.06	49.36	D1	343	320.92	41.28	19.14	428	3.69	.05
D2/01	93	366.65	53.51	D2	150	311.65	37.00	55.00	241	2.57	.05
D5/01	84	346.77	48.38	D5	117	328.09	45.37	18.68	199	2.78	.05
D1/02	62	326.23	49.23	D2	150	311.65	37.00	14.58	210	2.35	.05

Summary Statement: In Grade 3 Reading the Total FTX and Total Option 4 again significantly exceeded Total NFT in performance. FTX district groupings surpassing their respective NFT district groups were: Option 4 in Districts 1 and 2; Option 1 in Districts 1, 2 and 5, and again Option 2 in District 2.

*The NFT group is made up of Title I eligible students not in the Follow Through Program.

* See Tables 5 and 6 for legend.

Table 8

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of FTX Students and the NFT Title I Comparison Group in Grade One for Total Mathematics on the California Achievement Test, (CAT), February 1980.

Follow Through Expansion				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Difference	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Significance Level
Group*	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
TFTX	1579	241.80	26.13	NFT	941	239.19	24.93	2.61	2518	2.47	.05
TO4	398	245.62	24.08	NFT	941	239.19	24.93	6.43	1337	4.36	.05
TO1	736	244.18	27.20	NFT	941	239.19	24.93	4.99	1675	3.90	.05
D1/01	79	255.58	23.73	D1	268	238.50	24.59	17.08	345	5.45	.05
D3/01	220	254.86	26.60	D3	42	243.73	26.78	11.13	260	2.47	.05
D2/02	88	246.49	26.55	D2	170	237.31	23.81	9.18	256	2.81	.05
D1/04	69	245.87	22.04	D1	268	238.50	24.59	7.37	335	2.26	.05
D5/04	82	255.40	20.50	D5	92	232.94	25.30	22.46	172	6.35	.05
D7/04	26	243.96	19.10	D7	97	232.15	25.40	11.81	121	2.19	.05

Summary Statement: In Grade 1 Mathematics, the total FTX group as well as Total Options 1 and 4 scored significantly higher than the total NFT group. Furthermore, FTX district groupings were significantly higher than NFT district groups in the following cases: Option 1 in Districts 1 and 3; Option 4 in Districts 1, 5, and 7; and again Option 2 in District 2.

* See Tables 5 and 6 for legend.

Table 9

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of FTX Students and the NFT Title I Comparison Group in Grade Two for Total Mathematics on the California Achievement Test, (CAT), February, 1980.

Follow Through Expansion				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Difference	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Significance Level
Group *	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
TFTX	1527	274.09	29.35	NFT	950	271.04	26.20	3.05	2475	2.62	.05
TO4	454	278.48	30.38	NFT	950	271.04	26.20	7.44	1402	4.72	.05
D6/04	246	283.41	28.45	D6	82	268.02	27.02	15.39	326	4.28	.05
D5/01	90	282.78	25.72	D5	119	274.31	24.87	8.47	207	2.39	.05

Summary Statement: The Total FTX group and Total Option 4 again significantly outperformed the total NFT group. Only Option 4 in District 6 and Option 1 in District 5 surpassed their respective NFT district groups, however.

* See Tables 5 and 6 for legend.

Table 10

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of FTX Students and the NFT Title I Comparison Group in Grade Three for Total Mathematics on the California Achievement Test, (CAT), February, 1980.

Follow Through Expansion				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Difference	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Significance Level
Group*	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
D1/01	85	307.53	35.05	D1	343	299.30	32.02	8.23	426	2.08	.05
D2/01	95	307.64	34.11	D2	152	296.56	29.41	11.08	245	2.69	.05
D1/04	95	312.33	34.81	D1	342	299.30	32.02	13.03	435	3.43	.05
D2/04	58	317.84	37.40	D2	152	296.56	29.41	21.28	208	4.31	.05

Summary Statement: In Grade 3 Mathematics Only some FTX district groupings scored significantly higher than NFT groups. There were in the following four cases: Options 1 and 4 in Districts 1 and 2.

* See Tables 5 and 6 for legend.

III. PARENT INVOLVEMENT

A. Parent Volunteer Activities

Table 11

VOLUNTEER HOURS CONTRIBUTED BY ACTIVITY

Type of Involvement	Total Number of Volunteer Hours	Volunteer Hours Per Child Enrolled	Volunteer Hours As % of Total Hrs
Meetings	1,848.5	0.33	11.0%
Class Participation	12,303.5	2.20	73.2%
Class Trips	720.5	0.13	4.3%
Work Done at Home	74.	0.01	0.4%
Fund-Raising Work	1,197.	0.21	7.1%
Other	674.5	0.12	4.0%
Totals	16,818.0	3.01	100%

Summary Statement: These data were collected by ECEU staff utilizing the Parent Volunteer Work Record and the Parent Workshop Record. Data were collected for three time periods during the school year: September-October, November - January, and February - May. The data indicated that 16, 818 total hours were provided by parent volunteers. The majority 73.2% of those hours were devoted to classroom participation.

B. Parent Participation in Workshop Activities

Table 12

PARENT INVOLVEMENT WORKSHOP DATA	
Workshops attended Per Site[1]	13.81
Total Workshop Attendees	1,915
Total Workshop Attendance Hours	4,971.25
Workshop Attendance - Hours Per Child Enrolled	1.26

1. Mean Number of Sites, weighted, for schools submitting "Parent Workshop Records" - 17.16.

Summary Statement: Program parents attended an average of 13.81 workshops per program site providing a total of 4971.25 parent workshop hours. The workshops were organized and conducted by Parent Involvement Coordinators who visited each program school regularly.

Table 13

TOTAL COMBINED PARENT VOLUNTEER AND WORKSHOP HOURS		
Type of Contribution	Total Hours	Total Hours Per Child
Volunteer Hours	16,818.	3.0
Workshop Hours	4,971.25	1.26
Combined Hours	21,789.25	4.27

Summary Statement: Program parents contributed a combined total of 21,789.25 hours to program activity. This represented an average of 4.27 combined volunteer and workshop hours contributed per child enrolled in the program.

IV. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

A. Responses to Survey/Staff Background

Table 14

Reported Educational Background Characteristics of Teachers (T) and Aides (A). (Gives % only).

Years of Early Childhood Teaching Experience	Percentage		Years of Teaching Experience in FTX Program	Percentage	
	T	A		T	A
Less than one year	3%	0%	Less than one year	8%	0%
1 - 3 years	3%	4%	Less than one year	28%	27%
4 - 6 years	15%	23%	4 - 6 years	47%	42%
7 - 10 years	38%	15%	7 - 10 years	10%	7%
More than 10 years	37%	50%	More than 10 years	3%	19%
Not applicable	0	0		-	-

Summary Statement: These data were obtained from returns on the Staff Development Questionnaire developed by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit (ECEU) of the Office of Research and Evaluation. The instrument has been in use for four years and revised each year to reflect program changes and concerns of program staff.

The questionnaire identified background information on staff and assesses quantity, quality and preference for certain types of staff development. It is administered in basically the same form across all early childhood programs to teachers, assistant teachers and aides; responses are anonymous. A 25 percent randomly selected sample of Follow Through Expansion Program personnel was surveyed.

Seventy-eight questionnaires were sent to Follow Through Expansion teachers and 60 (77%) were returned. In addition, 39 questionnaires were sent to Follow Through Expansion classrooms to gather aide responses. Of the 39 aides who received questionnaires, twenty-six (66%) responded.

Follow Through Expansion teachers and aides have considerable early childhood experience. Seventy-five percent and 65% of the teachers and aides respectively had 7 or more years experience. Sixty percent of the teachers and 68% of the aides reported teaching four or more years in the Follow Through Expansion Program.

B. Frequency/Types of Staff Development

Table 15

Percentage of Follow Through Expansion Teachers (T) and Aides (A) Indicating Varying Amounts Received of Different Forms of Staff Development.

Forms of Staff Development Provided	1 - 5		6 - 10		Over 10		None	
	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Workshops - Formal Staff Development Sessions	60%	65%	18%	12%	2%	12%	13%	4%
Classroom Demonstrations/ On-site Training	48	50	10	4	2	12	30	19
Group Meetings	47	50	18	8	8	31	17	4
Individual Conferences	43	50	15	4	12	23	17	12
Informal Communications	32	23	30	27	23	31	3	4
Written Communications (Memos, Newsletters, etc.)	30	43	22	12	27	23	8	12
Faculty Meeting-time - Staff Development	57	62	22	8	8	27	8	0

Summary Statement: The majority (53%) of the teachers received staff development most frequently, i.e., at least six times (combining the 6-10 and Over 10 categories) through informal communication.

Next in overall frequency were, in order: Faculty meeting-time, individual conferences, group meetings, workshops, and classroom demonstrations. Aides reported receiving staff development most frequently through informal communications and group meetings respectively.

C. Satisfaction with Staff Development

Table 16

Percentage of Teachers (T) and Aides (A) Indicating Levels of Satisfaction with Staff Development Types and Topics Provided by Resource/Support/Supervisory Personnel.

Types/Topics of Staff Development Provided	Levels of Satisfaction Reported					
	Generally Satisfied		Generally Not Satisfied		Not Applicable	
	T	A	T	A	T	A
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Conducts Workshops	68%	85%	15%	8%	13%	4%
Conducts Group Meetings	62	85	15	8	7	8
Informs you of Program Activities and Changes	73	69	10	8	7	8
Informs you of School Board Administrative Decisions and Procedures	43	62	28	19	22	4
Provides Classroom Demonstrations, or other On-site training	67	77	22	4	7	8
Locates available Resource Materials	78	81	8	8	8	4
Gives Support to Individual Concerns/Interpersonal Relationships	75	85	12	7	10	0
Gives Support in Solving Classroom Management Problems	52	77	18	12	23	4
Gives Suggestions about the effective use Curriculum	67	92	17	4	15	4
Offers Support Working with Paraprofessionals & Volunteers	73	77	12	4	10	15
Offers Support in Parent Involvement	65	81	13	4	18	15
Assists in Completion and Submission of Required Data and other Information	63	77	10	8	22	8
Gives Support in Helping to Individualize Instruction and/or Promote Small Group Instru.	67	85	15	4	12	8
Fosters Team Learning and Instruction	52	50	17	19	25	16

Summary Statement: With the exception of one area, (information re: administrative decisions) 50% or more of the teachers were satisfied with all staff development areas. The majority of the aides (50% to 92%) were satisfied with all of the areas. Teachers seem to be the least satisfied with information about local administrative decisions and classroom demonstrations; and aides appeared to be least satisfied with information about local administrative decisions, support for management problems, assistance in submitting required information, and team learning.

D. Preferences for Future Staff Development

Table 17

Five Areas Most Frequently Selected as "Preferred" for Future Staff Development by FTX Teachers.

Staff Development Area	Percentage Selecting
1. Using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum	38%
2. Individualizing Instruction	35%
3. Small Group Instruction	35%
4. Parent Involvement	32%
5. Improving the Basic	32%

Table 18

Areas Most Frequently selected by FTX Program Aides "Preferred" for Future Staff Development.

Staff Development Area	Percentage Selecting
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	62%
Social Behaviors, Human Relations and/or Interpersonal Skills	46%
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness	46%
Individualizing Instruction	35%
Dealing with Suspected Child Abuse/Neglect	31%
Curriculum Development	27%
Helping Children Take Test	23%
Small Group Instruction	23%

Summary Statement: Using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum was preferred most often for future staff development by teachers (38%) and aides (62%). Teachers than preferred, in order: individualizing instruction, small group instruction, parent involvement, and improving basic skills. Aides preferred, in order: social behavior, improving the basic skills, individualizing instruction, child abuse, curriculum development, helping children take test, and small group instruction.

E. Willingness to Attend Unreimbursed Staff Development

Table 19

Percentage of Teachers (T) and Aides (A) Expressing Willingness to Participate Without Reimbursement in Staff Development Focused on Selected Areas.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AREAS	Percent Willing to Participate Without Pay	
	T	A
Social Behaviors, Human Relations and/or Interpersonal Skills	23%	31%
Parent Involvement	20	35
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	32	42
Child Growth and Development Issues	12	42
Community Resources	15	23
Curriculum Development	12	19
Classroom Management	20	27
Model/Option Related Training	8	19
Minimal Essentials—Math and Language Skills	12	23
Helping Children Take Tests	15	31
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	20	19
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness	23	15
Utilization of Personnel	8	23
Individualizing Instruction	18	27
Special Education Issues	7	15
Using Teacher/Resource Center Facilities	25	15
Small Group Instruction	23	31
Desegregation	18	27
Learning about Commercial Materials	12	15
Team Teaching/Learning	8	31
Learning to Share Group Expertise	22	23
Dealing with Suspected Child	22	39

Summary Statement: Most teachers and aides were not willing to participate in staff development sessions without being reimbursed. However, using creative arts to enrich the curriculum was the area of staff development teachers (32%) and aides (42%) most often indicated that they would participate in without pay. A large percentage of the aides also were willing to attend child growth and development sessions.

F. Effectiveness of Staff Development

Table 20

Percentage of Teachers (T) and Aides (A) Indicating Varying Levels of Effectiveness of Different Types of Staff Development in Helping Them Do a Better Job in the Classroom.

Types of Staff Development	EXTENT OF CHANGE IN THE CLASSROOM							
	Little		Moderate		Great		Not Applic.	
	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A
Social Behaviors, Human Relations and/or Interpersonal Skills	27%	11%	30%	46%	5%	31%	28%	8%
Parent Involvement	23	15	33	31	23	31	12	55
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curric.	28	19	32	50	5	12	25	15
Child Growth and Development	27	23	30	31	7	19	23	15
Community Resources	43	27	12	27	7	23	28	15
Curriculum Development	20	19	33	42	17	27	22	4
Classroom Management	27	23	23	35	13	27	22	8
Model/Option Related Training	20	15	15	46	22	15	32	8
Minimal Essentials — Math and Language Skills	20	19	38	31	22	38	13	0
Helping Children Take Tests	27	15	33	39	12	23	22	4
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	33	23	23	15	8	31	27	23
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness	22	15	33	31	20	31	20	0
Utilization of Personnel	28	19	32	19	15	39	15	8
Individualizing Instruction	27	15	28	31	15	39	22	9
Special Education Issues	32	12	13	39	3	8	40	27
Using Teacher/Resource Center Facilities	30	8	17	39	20	27	23	15
Small Group Instruction	23	19	30	23	23	42	15	8
Desegregation	25	35	10	27	5	4	52	23
Learning About Commercial Materials	28	23	22	39	17	23	22	4
Team Teaching/Learning	23	19	20	23	8	19	35	19
Learning to Share Group Expertise	27	8	18	54	18	23	28	8
Dealing with Suspected Child Abuse/Neglect	28	27	15	19	0	8	48	31

Summary Statement: Five staff development areas were identified by at least 50% of the teachers as being moderately to greatly effective in helping them to do a better job in the classroom: parent involvement, curriculum development, minimal essentials, improving the basic skills, and small group instruction. The majority of aides, (50% to 77%) felt that 17 of the 22 areas were effective, i.e., all except that session on sharing group expertise, individualizing instruction, interpersonal skills, minimal essentials in Math and Language Skills, etc.

V. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

A. Number of Children Who Received Physical Examinations and Medical Screenings

Table 21

Number (N) and Percentage (%) of Children Who Received Physical Examinations and Vision, Hearing, Growth and Dental Screenings

Program Enrollment [1]	Physical Examinations (Gr. One)		Completed Screening							
			Vision		Hearing		Growth		Dental	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
7133	1583	86%	5857	82%	5437	76%	4334	61%	5406	76%

Summary Statement: Physical examinations were mandated by the School District of Philadelphia's Health Division in Grade One. Eighty-six percent of the FTX children in grade one received physical examinations. The majority of the children in grades 1, 2, and 3, received medical and dental screenings which included vision (82%), hearing (76%), growth (61%) and dental (76%).

B. Treatment Status of Referred Health Problems

Table 22

Number (N) and Percentage (%) of Referred Health Problems Under Treatment or With Treatment Completed

Problems	Found Through Screenings or Physical Examinations	Referred		Treatment Completed or Under Care	
	N	N	%	N	%
Vision (Screening)	626	626	100	298	48
Hearing (Screening)	151	151	100	72	48
Growth (Screening)	170	170	100	61	36
Medical (Physical (Examination)	619	619	100	286	46
Dental (Examination)	1970	1970	100	690*	35
TOTAL	3536	3536	100	1407	40

* Data was received from 24 of the 28 FTX schools.

Summary Statement: Three thousand five hundred and thirty-six medical problems were found through screenings or physical examinations: 56% of the problems were related to dental, 18% medical, (those identified through physical examination) and 17% vision. All of the problems were referred for treatment. Of that number, 40% were either under care or had treatment completed by the end-of the-year.